

answering messages based on the received caller ID, and the time that the incoming call is received by the mobile communication terminal.

First, neither Sheerin nor Drake discloses or suggests a mobile communication terminal having call answering message selection according to caller ID information.

Second, neither Sheerin nor Drake discloses the association of different call answering messages with a single caller ID based on the time that the incoming call signal is received.

In Drake, every caller receives the same message based on the time of day of the incoming call. There is no association of different call answering messages with a single caller ID based on time of call. Similarly, in Sheerin, specific caller IDs are associated with different voice mailboxes for different users. There is no association of different messages with a single caller ID. Thus, even if Sheerin were to be modified by Drake, the claimed invention would not be achieved, even accepting the Examiner's characterization of the disclosures of Sheerin and Drake.

In other words, in the invention as set forth in claim 6, a single caller ID making a call to the same user (i.e., mobile communication terminal) will receive a different call answering message, based on the time of the call, than another caller ID making a call to the same mobile communication terminal during the same time. In contrast, the Office action's proposed Sheerin/Drake combination would output the same answering message to each incoming caller to a specific user at the same time.

To reiterate, as explained in the prior response Sheerin discloses a multiple user answering machine having a different voice mailbox for each user of the machine. Each user has an individual call answering message stored in his mailbox that is played to a caller directed to that voice mailbox. In addition, there is a general or "home" voice mailbox. The Sheerin system contains a database of caller ID information associated with user voice mailbox identification.

When an incoming call is received, the caller ID information is checked against the database to determine whether it is associated with a particular user's mailbox. If so, the system plays a call answering message associated with the user's mailbox, and the caller leaves a voice message in the user's mailbox. If not, the caller is routed to the home mailbox where an answering message is played and the caller leaves a message

in the home mailbox. It is here emphasized that in Sheerin, all caller IDs associated with a single user will be routed to that user's voice mailbox and will receive the same message.

Drake discloses an automated voice message generation system, wherein a user's appointment data as entered into a computer system is used to generate a call answering message based on the date and time of the received call. For instance, if an incoming call is received at 10 a.m. on September 7, the system checks to determine if appointment data exists for that date and time. If so, the appointment text data is sent to a voice synthesizer to generate an answering message incorporating the appointment text data so as to specify to the caller the reason that the user is not available to answer the call.

In both Sheerin and Drake, and contrary to the invention as set forth in claim 6, every caller to a specific user will receive the same message. Consequently, no combination of Sheerin and Drake would achieve the invention of claim 6, wherein incoming calls for the same user of the mobile communication terminal are capable of receiving different call answering messages based on the received caller ID, and the time that the incoming call from a particular caller as identified by the caller ID is received.

None of the Fuller, Chin or Oshima references cures the basic deficiencies of the main proposed prior art combination with respect to claim 6, and consequently none of those references renders any of claims 7-10 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

In view of the foregoing, favorable reconsideration of this application, withdrawal of the outstanding grounds of rejection, and the issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Please charge any fee or credit any overpayment pursuant to 37 CFR 1.16 or 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 02-2135.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,					
NAME AND REG. NUMBER	Vincent M. DeLuca Attorney for Applicant Registration No. 32,408				
SIGNATURE	Vincent M De Luca			DATE	17 APR 02
Address	Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck Suite 800, 1425 K Street, N.W.				
City	Washington	State	D.C.	Zip Code	20005
Country	U.S.A.	Telephone	202-783-6040	Fax	202-783-6031